

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

PAT RAST and DAN ADAMS,

Appellants,

v.

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-03-0012

ALLO-03-0013

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. These appeals came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, on Appellant Rast's exceptions to the Director's determination dated January 30, 2003. At the outset of the hearing, both parties agreed to consolidate the Dan Adams allocation appeal with Mr. Rast's appeal. The hearing was held at the office of the Attorney General, large conference room, Spokane, Washington, on December 1, 2004. BUSSE NUTLEY, Vice Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, reviewed the record, including the file, exhibits, and the entire taped proceedings, and participated in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellants Pat Rast and Dan Adams were present and were represented by Kandys Dygert, Union Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. JoLynn Rogers, Director of Human Resources, represented Respondent Eastern Washington University (EWU).

Background. On December 21, 2001, Appellants submitted Position Questionnaires (PQs) requesting that their Electrician positions be reallocated to the Information Technology System

1 Specialist III classification. At the time Appellants made their requests for reallocation, they were
2 working on the EWU Network Upgrade Project. Appellants' supervisor, Electrical Supervisor
3 Larry Montague, disagreed with Appellants' descriptions of their job duties. While working on the
4 network upgrade, Appellants' work was supervised by a Computer Maintenance Technical Lead;
5 however, Mr. Montague continued to act as their supervisor.

6
7 When Appellants submitted their PQ's, the Personnel Resources Board had not yet adopted the new
8 Information Technology series, which was slated to go into effect on January 1, 2002. However,
9 JoLynn Rogers, Director of Human Resources, reviewed Appellants' requests for reallocation and
10 considered the Information Technology Systems Specialist classification series. She also based
11 their position reviews on work performed for the six-month period prior to December 21, 2001.
12 After a work audit, Ms. Rogers concluded Appellants' work consisted of the following:

13 Replacing 8 wire voice and data jacks on category 5 telecommunications wire on
14 the station end of that circuit; testing the wire using a test meter that measures all
15 the required parameters and if the test fails, replacing the wire; installing panels
16 and cleaning up the wiring in the telecom closets; rearranging equipment on the
17 equipment racks; upgrading the electrical circuits in the rooms by interpreting
18 electrical cords, pulling fiber optic and telecommunications wire; terminating
19 copper voice and data portions (not the fiber optics); and verifying installations
20 inspection with information resource specialists.

21
22 In memos dated March 1, 2002, Ms. Rogers informed Appellants that the above duties were not
23 ITSS duties and that they were correctly classified as Electricians.

24
25 On March 28, 2002, Appellants requested reviews with the Department of Personnel. On
26 September 24, 2002, Joe Gross, Human Resource Consultant, conducted allocation reviews of
Appellants' positions. However, Mr. Gross did not consider the new IT series because the series
had not yet been adopted when Appellants submitted their PQs asking for reallocation. Rather, Mr.
Gross considered the computer series that was in effect prior to January 1, 2002. By letter dated

1 January 30, 2003, Teri Thompson informed Appellants of Mr. Gross' determination that their
2 positions were properly allocated as Electricians.

3
4 On March 4, 2003, Appellants filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board.

5
6 **Summary of Appellants' Argument.** Appellants argue that DOP erred by not considering the
7 ITSS III level. Appellants argue that DOP should have considered the new IT series not only
8 because the agency considered it, but because they filed for allocation review only eight days prior
9 to the adoption of the series. Appellants argue the work they performed was not typical electrician
10 work but was performed exclusively for the network and telecommunications systems at the
11 University, as supported by their PQs. Appellants assert that, unlike electrician work, they upgraded
12 the information data, which is entirely different than dealing with circuits, running wire, and other
13 electrical duties. Appellants assert that although they were assigned out of the electrical shop, they
14 had no contact with their chain of command. Appellants argue that they should be allocated to the
15 ITSS 3 classification.

16
17 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the agency's human resources
18 staff reviewed the ITSS 3 classification at the Appellants' request. Respondent asserts that it was
19 DOP's decision to review the computer class specifications that were in effect at the time
20 Appellants submitted their PQs. Respondent acknowledges that Appellants were performing work
21 on the Network Upgrade project. However, Respondent contends that the actual work performed
22 by Appellants was electrician work and not IT work. Respondent asserts Appellants' work required
23 replacement, installation, maintenance and troubleshooting telecommunication wires and circuits,
24 not performing work as described in the IT series. Respondent argues that Appellants are more
25 appropriately allocated to the Electrician classification.

1 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
2 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
3 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
4 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
5 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
6 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
7 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
8 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

9
10 The first issue here is whether the director's designee erred when he reviewed the class
11 specifications that were in effect on December 21, 2001, the date Appellants submitted their PQs,
12 rather than the IT series that was adopted by the Personnel Resources Board on January 1, 2002.
13 Because the ITSS series was not adopted as of the date Appellants submitted their PQs, the
14 director's designee appropriately reviewed computer series classifications that were in effect on
15 December 21, 2001. Therefore, we will consider only the computer/information technology classes
16 that the director's designee reviewed: Computer Maintenance Technician, Computer Support
17 Analyst, Computer Support Technician, Computer Services Consultant, Network Analyst, Scientific
18 Programmer, Systems Analyst/Programmer, Systems Programmer, Telecommunications Analyst, as
19 well as the class of Electrician.

20
21 The second issue here is whether director's designee erred when he concluded that the work
22 performed by Appellants during the time period in question was Electrician level work rather than
23 computer/information technology work.

24
25 In this case, Appellants have not established that their duties and responsibilities are consistent with
26 those intended to be encompassed by the computer/information technology series. Although

1 Appellants were part of a project directed at upgrading the University's network, the focus of their
2 work was to replace, test and troubleshoot the wiring on electrical, data and telecommunications
3 circuits. Appellants have failed to prove that the thrust of their work involved tasks such as
4 diagnosing hardware and software, technical computer support, maintenance, troubleshooting of
5 computers or computing problems or providing technical assistance in the use of information
6 technology. Therefore, the director's designee appropriately concluded that the scope and level of
7 responsibilities assigned to Appellants' positions were best described by the Electrician
8 classification.

9
10 The appeal on exceptions by Appellants should be denied and the Director's determinations, dated
11 January 30, 2003, should be affirmed and adopted.

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeals on exceptions by Appellants are
15 denied and the Director's determinations, dated January 30, 2003, are affirmed and adopted.

16
17 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2005.

18
19 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

20
21 _____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

22
23 _____
Busse Nutley, Vice Chair

24
25 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Member

26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26